

## **BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT**

### **CONFERENCE REPORT**

**DATE OF CONFERENCES:** September 6 and 13, 2007

**LOCATION OF CONFERENCES:** JO Morton Building

**ATTENDED BY:** Nadine Peterson, Mark Hemmerlein, Marc Laurin, Kevin Nyhan, Steve Liakos, Bill Oldenburg, Chris Waszczuk, Jim Marshall, Christine Perron, and Mike Dugas NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Edna Feighner, and Linda Wilson, NHDHR; Bill O'Donnell FHWA; Peter Walker and Peter Clary, VHB; Jason Gallant and Marty Bower, Louis Berger; David Beauchesne, Manchester Planning Department; Jamie Paine and Jaime Harned, CLD; and Jim Bouchard, HL Turner.

*SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting*

Thursday, September 6, 2007

**Portsmouth, BRF-X-0182(066), 10665. Participants: Pete Walker, Pete Clary, Jim Marshall, and Marc Laurin.**

P. Walker summarized the impacts to the cultural resources that are to occur as a result of the proposed project. The project will have a Section 106 Adverse Effect due to the demolition of the railroad bridge. J. McKay stated that the effects on the resources need to be presented in Municipally Managed memo format. HAER documentation of the bridge needs to be done, and should include background information on the railroad line and bridges. It appears that the impacts on the Diamond House may be a temporary easement and therefore not involve an adverse effect or a 4(f). Similarly, the small impact on the Sherburne House would not involve an adverse effect. B. O'Donnell stated that a Section 4(f) evaluation must be done, which will include discussions of all the 4(f) properties. An MOA will also be needed, but can wait until after comments have been received on the draft environmental document and 4(f) evaluation. A discussion of Section 4(f) recreational impacts due to moving utilities on the city park followed. Due to the disturbances to the cemeteries and their potential for archeological impacts, J. McKay stated that there needs to be further coordination with E. Feighner. Due diligence must be used to investigate these proposed impacts. P. Walker stated the Phase IB report has been sent to DHR but no comments have yet been received. He also noted that the need to build a retaining wall may require some additional impacts to the Calvary Cemetery, and they will require further examination.

**Newington-Dover, NHS-0271(037), 11238. Participants: Chris Waszczuk (2171) and Marc Laurin.**

C. Waszczuk handed out a status update on the project funding and discussed the need for additional revenues. Specific to the General Sullivan Bridge (GSB) rehabilitation, he stated that the rehabilitation continues to be a part of the FEIS commitments, and the Department feels there is merit in this action. Advertising the rehab is anticipated for October 2014 with a 2-year construction schedule. The Special Committee meeting recently held approved the layout of the project, though concerns on the funding issues remain. Additional scrutiny on aspects of the project will need to be done, such as increases in tolls, additional Federal funding, etc...B. O'Donnell wondered if DHR should discuss their concerns directly to the Commissioner. C. Waszczuk replied that he is aware of their concerns and the commitment to rehab the GSB is documented in the Report of the Commissioner and in the signed MOA. DHR could convey the magnitude of the importance at the GACIT meetings being held to evaluate the State's Ten-Year Transportation Plan, the meetings scheduled in the area are on the 20<sup>th</sup> in Dover and the 26<sup>th</sup> in Portsmouth. J. Garvin and L. Wilson expressed their appreciation to hear that the GSB rehab is being retained and under serious consideration by the Department. In answer to L. Wilson's inquiry, C. Waszczuk stated that the rehabilitations will provide for emergency access from Newington only and will not be able to be used for Turnpike traffic redundancy as the entire northern approach will be removed.

**Pelham, X-A000(415), 14491. Participants: Kevin Nyhan, Nadine Peterson, and Christopher Waszczuk.**

The Department is in the process of completing a CSS project in the Town of Pelham's town center. This intersection (NH Route 111A/ Nashua Road/ Old Bridge Street/ Main Street) experiences heavy traffic during peak hours. Six alternatives have been developed through the CSS process to address the problem. They include the "no build" option, two signal alternatives and three roundabout alternatives.

Nadine Peterson provided an overview of the Department's survey process. The town center has changed through time and the first step is to determine how this occurred. This is especially important as several alternative involve impacts to the town common and/or the adjacent fire station. The next step would be to complete a district area form and associated individual surveys. This information would be used to ensure that the alternative chosen represents the "least impacting practicable alternative."

Chris Waszczuk asked whether any of the alternatives had fatal flaws. No one in attendance offered a single fatal flaw with any project but supported was given for the roundabout alternative "A," which constructs two roundabouts: one by the town offices and the other by the town common.

This project will be reviewed again once survey information has been gathered. The project is scheduled to advertise in the spring of 2008.

**Haverhill-Bath, BRS-HP-STP-TE-X-000S(332), 13095. Participant: Jim Garvin.**

J. Garvin and J. McKay met with Neil English, town administrator for Haverhill; Alan Rutherford, the town administrator for Bath; Wright Construction; and Sean James of HTA at the site of the bridge on August 27, 2007. J. Garvin updated the committee on the project. He had not received an up-to-date set of the plans until August 29<sup>th</sup> by email, with a paper set on September 6, and he had not been invited to review the project since February. The conditional adverse effect memo indicated that NHDHR's review was to be an on-going process as inspection of the bridge proceeded. Guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, the project was to retain as much original material as possible. Because this bridge displays characteristics of the Town lattice bridge that are not seen in later examples, it represents a very significant example of the type.

J. Garvin had several questions of the work. He noted that the bridge had been listing to the east several years ago, and the NHDOT had attempted to shore it. This effort did place additional stresses on the bridge. NHDHR has not received lifting plans yet, but as described on August 27<sup>th</sup>, the general plan was to place steel towers at either end of the bridge, and lift with high tension rods placed diagonally through the roof and floor. Steel frames would be wrapped around the truss to provide stability to the whole as it was lifted. The ends of the laminated arches will also require lifting to achieve the necessary repairs of the laminations. His concern is for the stresses that the lifting may create in the lattice members during these repairs and the effort to straighten the bridge.

A second issue included the purchase of 3" planking and other wood members to replace lattice and chord members. J. Garvin was uncertain that all the scheduled replacements were necessary and that there may be pressure to utilize all the ordered wood. For example, it was not clear that the lattice members at the ends of the bridge received the same level of stress that necessitated replacement as those positioned at the front of the abutments or the center pier. HTA had not provided him the stress analysis that supported the need for such replacements. He had inspected the fourth or bottom chord and agreed to the replacements along it, with the proviso that if wood is found to be sound during the field inspection or during removal of the chord planks, it not be replaced.

Thirdly, J. Garvin thought that the issue of sistering vs. splicing had been resolved prior to signing the conditional adverse affect memo. This memo states that sistering will be used to strengthen members if the member is not visible, resulting in preservation of the original material per the Secretary of Interior Standards. Splicing can be used in visible areas. HTA most recently stated that it was not planning to sister any members. In fact inspection of the wood has found that although the wood (white pine) of many member along the bottom of the bridge looks fuzzy or frayed, solid wood with sufficient cross section to withstand the anticipated stresses lies below this veneer. This veneer has been removed with pressure washing in one test area.

J. Garvin will prepare a letter confirming his review of the bottom chord and agreeing to the proposed use of tongue and groove side sheathing instead of shiplapped sheathing boards as specified in the effect memo. He will review the plans and provide comments on them, particularly addressing the above concerns. It was additionally agreed that if the excavation of the towers remained within the paved way, then their construction should avoid areas that may hold archaeological sensitivity. It was agreed that the review might proceed more smoothly if Dave Powelson could attend the next construction meeting in late September.

**Bartlett 14372. Participants: Mark Hemmerlein and Steve Liakos**

James Garvin distributed a list of “Questions Regarding a Proposal to Remove the Bridge,” dated 9/6/2007, noting that he had put these questions in written form so that there would be a permanent record of the discussion and the issues that the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources (DHR) considers to be unresolved as of this date.

Garvin noted that the status of Section 4(f) and Section 106 review of NHDOT’s proposal to remove the bridge is unclear to the DHR staff, and that DHR is uncertain of its status in the review. DHR had not seen a copy of DOT’s “Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation” until it received a paper copy at a DOT cultural resources meeting in August 2007, nor had DHR seen copies of letters by which this document had been transmitted to the Department of the Interior for review. Meanwhile, DHR had begun to receive telephone inquiries regarding its reaction to the proposed removal from both the National Park Service (NPS) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). DHR had verbally replied to these inquiries that it disagreed 1) that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to removal of the bridge and 2) that all possible planning for preservation of the bridge had been carried out as of this date. NHDHR expressed concern about the integrity of the 4(f) process since these two measures do not seem to have been fulfilled in the case of the Bartlett Bridge. Neglect of the bridge was not the original intent of the agreement signed in 1986.

It was noted that Katry Harris from the ACHP had responded by letter to FHWA’s request for comment and indicated that the ACHP did not wish to participate in the consultation process. She noted that the ACHP might change that status if NHDHR requested its participation in writing. As of the writing of the letter by FHWA, she stated that the ACHP reluctantly agreed that there appeared to be no feasible and prudent alternative to bridge removal and that it awaited the MOA, which would resolve the adverse effects with NHDHR.

Steve Liakos confirmed that the bridge removal is still an active DOT project. Per the current project description, S. Liakos indicated that NHDOT could do one of two things: move forward with removal, whether demolition or relocation to another site, or drop the project. Any other action would need to be completed as a different project. William O’Donnell confirmed that FHWA had transmitted DOT’s “Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation” to the Department of the Interior with comments that indicate FHWA’s support for the proposed removal.

All parties agreed that this discussion should be considered as a rationale for DHR to draft and submit a rebuttal of the removal arguments put forth in DOT’s “Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation.” All interested parties, including NPS and ACHP, shall receive copies of all future documents.

**Lebanon, X-A000(232), 14194. Participants: Jason Gallant and Marty Bowers, The Louis Berger Group, Inc.**

This project was last reviewed on 12 April 2007, as a result of which the Memorandum of Effect (originally executed in July 2006) was revised to specify that there would be no adverse effect on archaeological resources if the temporary crossing of the Mascoma River was confined to the abandoned former right-of-way of Route 10 approximately 65’ upstream of the current bridge

center line. Additionally, plans for the temporary crossing would need to be reviewed by NHDHR.

The purpose of the meeting on 04 September 2007 was to review final plans for the project, including the temporary crossing. Jason Gallant presented an overview of the project, which involves rehabilitation of the existing bridge with no alterations to existing girders or piers, as before indicated. The structural remnants of the old bridge (on the abandoned right-of-way) are not expected to be removed or cut down for installation of the temporary bridge, nor would the project involve the timber bridge that carries a recreational trail over the railroad line.

Reviewers agreed that the conditions of the Memorandum of Effect had been met, and that no further review of this project is required. It was noted that Berger's design did not affect the character-defining features of this early example of a variable section bridge designed by Harold Langley.

**Epsom 14896 (no federal number). Participants: Jason Gallant and Marty Bowers, The Louis Berger Group, Inc.**

The purpose of this meeting was to present information about proposed replacement of the Center Hill Road Bridge in Epsom and potential effects to cultural resources. Jason Gallant presented an overview of the project.

The existing one-span bridge, built in 1930, is a steel beam deck structure approximately 22 feet long and 22.5 feet wide. The concrete abutments, which have no wingwalls, were constructed in two phases, apparently associated with a widening of the bridge in 1980. The older portion appears to be a gravity abutment, while the newer section is a cantilever abutment with constant stem thickness.

Flooding in mid-April 2007 inundated the road and bridge. Scour under the west abutment resulted in rotation of the newer section of abutment over 9 inches in 8 feet, and relocation of this abutment section laterally downstream. The undermining racked the bridge superstructure and allowed backfill to wash out of the opened construction joint in the abutment. The bridge was subsequently closed to all traffic.

The Town of Epsom wishes to install a pre-engineered replacement bridge at the crossing before this winter with minimal approach work, followed by roadway reconstruction in the spring of 2008. It is anticipated that a temporary bridge will not be required and that all work associated with the project will be within the right-of-way. The elevation of the new roadway will be slightly higher than that of the existing bridge. There would be no changes to the existing alignment of Sanborn Hill Road where it intersects with Center Hill Road.

Joyce McKay said that the project area appears disturbed, thus indicating that potential effects to archaeological resources would not be an issue. James Garvin stated that the bridge did not appear to be eligible for the National/State Registers, with which other reviewers concurred. Linda Wilson asked about the late 19<sup>th</sup> century house on Center Hill Road approximately 275 feet to the east of the bridge. Jason Gallant said that the increased roadway elevation might require some cutting into the front lawn of this house, but that the property owner had no objections.

The reviewers agreed that the replacement of the Center Hill Road Bridge as proposed would have no adverse effect on historic properties unless impacts extended further onto the above

property than currently thought. In this case, some additional review may be required. Berger is to draft a Cultural Resources Memorandum of Effect for this municipally managed project, and it would be signed at the next meeting.

*Thursday, September 13, 2007*

**Manchester, B&M Rail corridor. Participant: David Beauchesne, Manchester Planning Dept. (624-6450X5712; [Dbeauche@manchesternh.gov](mailto:Dbeauche@manchesternh.gov)).**

In 2005, the state transferred to the City of Manchester the 1300-foot state-owned, abandoned Portsmouth Branch Railroad corridor, which parallels Candia Road. As a condition of the sale, the state requested that the city review impacted parcels with the Division of Historical Resources for archaeological sensitivity. David Beauchesne stated that an adjacent landowner, Kevin Lane of 175 Revere Ave., Manchester, had requested the purchase of parcel 254-20 (RR parcel 28/39) along the railroad corridor. E. Feighner requested a combined Phase IA and IB investigation with results provided in a letter report. The purchaser would do the survey. The survey would primarily be geared toward Native American use, but should address potential use by the railroad.

**Sanbornton, 14443 (no federal #). Participant: Jim Bouchard, HL Turner ([Jbouchard@hlturner.com](mailto:Jbouchard@hlturner.com)).**

The H.L. Turner Group Inc (TTG) is engaged by the Town of Sanbornton to undertake an engineering study for proposed improvements to Upper Bay Road and Hunkins Pond Road. The limits of work for Upper Bay Road is from the multiple intersection of Lower Road and Hunkins Pond Road northerly for 8400 LF to the intersection of Steele Hill Road. The limits of work for Hunkins Pond Road are from the westerly intersection with Parker Hill Road easterly 8000 LF to the multiple intersection of Lower Bay Road and Upper Bay Road.

TTG indicated that the roadway corridors have prescriptive rights-of-way defined by the presence of stone walls and other physical evidence. The average ROW is approximately 32 feet with widths ranging from 30 to 38 feet. The design intent for both corridors is to stay within the prescriptive ROW with no disturbance to stone walls.

The proposed program includes roadway reconstruction throughout the roadway corridors either as 1.) reclamation and repaving with provisions for geogrid within the reclaimed base or 2.) reclamation of pavements, reconstruction of the roadway box and repaving. In all cases, the existing roadway width of 18 feet will be preserved and not enhanced to allow for new drainage facilities. Super-elevation of curves will be preserved or provided throughout the corridors for better operational characteristics.

The roadway corridors are impacted by the lack of quality drainage systems, and it is proposed to utilize a number of scenarios for upgrade of drainage facilities: 1.) open roadside drainage where room permits; 2.) closed drainage systems where ROW and physical constraints prohibit open drainage swales; 3.) replacement and upsizing of cross culverts due to age and condition; 4.) introduction of new cross culverts where appropriate; and 5.) installation of underdrains. Numerous wetlands areas are present throughout the corridors and are being identified by a certified wetlands scientist.

A number of cultural resources exist through out the corridors as evidenced by small old roadside cemeteries, stonewalls, stone pillars, and vintage farm fields and structures. As work is to be confined to existing ROW impacts to these resources are negligible save for a cemetery located at approximate Sta. 150+00 Right. This location is close to the road edge and atop of current 6+ Ft vertical cut. The engineering study will identify that special slope stabilization such as large unit segmental block retaining walls should be considered for installation. SHPO noted that local cemetery commission should be contacted for coordination and that here an archaeologists would likely be needed to monitor the slope cut. In general, if work occurs within 25' of a cemetery, archaeological monitoring is requested because of the tendency to find unmarked burials outside the walls surrounding the cemetery.

The project was currently considered to have no adverse affects.

**Claremont, X-A000(418), 14494. Participant: Nadine Peterson.**

A form documenting the culvert that is believed to be identified for replacement by the above project was reviewed. It is located at the intersection of Maple Avenue, Pleasant Street, and Charlestown Road (NH Routes 11 and 12). It is located on the outskirts of town and not in an eligible district. It was noted that one face of the culvert was covered with concrete with a return about 3'-10" into the culvert. However, the remainder of the interior walls appeared to be intact. A metal pipe runs through it perpendicular to the culvert. The culvert appeared to have mid-level integrity and is not necessarily eligible. Since comparative information is not yet available, Linda Wilson asked Jim Marshall to coordinate with the committee when the recommended design for the intersection was better known.

**Durham 14553 (no federal funds). Participant: Jamie Paine and Jaime Harned, CLD.**

Jamie Paine and Jaime Harned from CLD Consulting Engineers presented a proposed project from the Town of Durham to replace the two adjacent single lane bridges (070/072 and 069/072) that carry Wiswall Road over the Lamprey River. The bridges were overtopped during the spring 2006 storms and a temporary bridge is currently servicing the area. The project is being funded using State and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) monies.

**1. Background Information**

The Town of Durham wishes to replace the bridges at the crossing of Wiswall Road over the Lamprey River, which are two, single-span, single-lane bridges (NHDOT#s 069/072 and 070/072). These bridges are on the NHDOT Redlist and are included in the Town's Capital Improvements Plan for replacement.

During the May 2006 flooding, the bridge sustained severe structural damage and was closed to traffic. Currently, a temporary Bailey Bridge has been installed on top of the damaged bridge.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

The bridges date to 1950 and are adjacent to the Wiswall Dam. Both spans are steel I-beam structures with concrete decks. In 1976, the east span received a replacement concrete deck constructed with corrugated metal forms. The curbs were removed and the bridge rails were attached to the beam fascias. The bridge spans are founded on concrete abutments caps placed on

top of stone abutments. The stone pier in the center was constructed using the stone bridge abutments, stone retaining walls on the sides, and fill in between. The crossing is located on the Lamprey River several hundred feet upstream from a dam, the Wiswall Dam. J. Garvin noted that the use of such a large center pier is similar to the crossing of the Lamprey River at Epping (13940).

The Wiswall Falls Mill Site, located immediately southeast/downstream of the project site, has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places (March 1998) in recognition of the extensive 19th century mill complex located at this site. The area had been a mill site and an ancient crossing. The adjacent falls had been used as a source of waterpower since the 1600s. It once included a dam and sawmill erected about 1835, a later gristmill, a paper mill by 1853-83, and a hydroelectric generating plant was built after a fire of 1896 and flooding at the mill site. In an area below Wadleigh Falls, archaeologists have documented artifacts over 8,000 years old that are among the earliest archaeological artifacts in New Hampshire (per NHDES Rivers Management Program), so there is a potential for Native American Pre-contact archaeological deposits. It was also noted that a potentially eligible dwelling was located nearby. However, at this time, there is no plan to impact the parcel on which it stands.

### **EXISTING PIER REMOVAL AND SINGLE-SPAN STRUCTURES**

The bridge suffered damage in the flood of May 2006. Construction of a new bridge may require the removal of the existing 24-foot-wide pier to achieve the desired opening size. The Town would like to keep the bridge as a single-lane section.

## **2. Proposed Project Description**

Single span and two span replacement bridges have been reviewed. Concrete beam single- and two-span arrangements were the only viable options since they would fit between the profiles and the 100-year floodplain plus one-foot of freeboard elevation. Steel girder options were too deep to fit the single span options. Also single span options where new abutments were placed behind the existing abutments were also too deep to fit within the profiles so they were also eliminated from further consideration.

In order to address a flooding concern across Wiswall Road east of the bridge location, a low spot in the road profile is proposed to be raised to 1 foot above the 100-year floodplain.

The Town's preference at this time is a single span structure that would remove the current pier from the river. Removing the pier would remove a substantial impediment from the river, which has collected large trees during storm events.

## **3. Proposed Project/Impacts Associated with Project**

The proposed project would have the following approximate impacts (based on current design considerations) in or adjacent to the Lamprey River:

- The approximate area of the pier island is 30 ft by 30 ft, resulting in a disturbance/clearance in the river of 900 sq ft if the pier is removed. The volume of removal at the pier would be 480cy (assuming removal of pier extends from bridge seat per survey, to an approximated ledge elevation of 46 ft).
- Linear areas of impact along the river associated with the project are expected as follows:
  - Abutment A (Western Limit): 71ft
  - Pier: 34ft
  - Abutment B (Eastern Limit): 63ft



- Temporary Work Trestle: 46ft
- Overall Length, both sides (not including trestle): 75ft
- Overall Length, both sides (including trestle): 92ft
- Wetland impacts associated with the project are currently projected as follows:
  - Permanent Wetland Impacts = 3829 sq ft
  - Abutment A = 1605 sq ft
  - Abutment B = 1068 sq ft
  - Pier = 1156 sq ft
  - Temporary Wetland Impacts for Work Trestle = 4,296 sq ft

#### 4. NHDHR Determination

NHDHR determined that a professional archaeologist must review the project area. The archaeologist must complete a combined Phase IA and IB. Such a study would include shovel testing and soil auguring and literature search including the review of historic maps, data related to the development of the mill site, and the review identified sites in the area to determine the potential for sensitive resources in the area.

In addition, a professional architectural historian must also review the area. The historian must complete a Project Area Form, which will show how the adjacent buildings and mill related to the Mill Dam Community. Their review should show the evolution of the bridge crossings at this location. Materials already exist that may help with these reviews, such as the Historic District Nomination forms previously committed and reports completed by the NHDES Dam Bureau. It was noted that if the pier were removed, it should be documented as it currently exists and as it is being taken down to understand how it was constructed.

In addition, NHDHR would like the Town to receive input from the Town's residents regarding whether the exiting pier should remain in the river or should be removed. The pier of bridge in Epping was preserved based on public sentiment. *A public meeting was then held on September 18, 2007 to present proposed concepts and to receive public input. No one present at this meeting requested that the center pier be preserved or had any problems with the proposed concept to remove the pier.*

#### **Ossipee Surplus Land, SP-7438B. Participant: Christine Perron.**

This wooded 0.31-acre parcel is located on the east side of NH Route 16 on an undeveloped parcel in a subdivision and has been requested by an abutter. The parcel is located in an archaeologically sensitive area; therefore, E. Feighner asked that any prospective buyer be required to complete a combined Phase 1A/1B archaeological survey prior to the sale of the parcel. If the survey finds no resources, then a letter report would be acceptable. If this survey finds archaeological deposits, then further testing would be required to determine significance (Phase II survey). If significant, the site would require avoidance or data recovery.

#### **Keene Surplus Land, SP-10309. Participant: Christine Perron.**

The Harold Chandler House, located at 431 Main Street, was purchased by the Department in 2000 in connection with the Keene-Swanzey bypass, but will not be impacted by construction.

The Department is now requesting to sell the property. The house has been determined to be a contributing element to the South Main Street District. NHDHR requested that a preservation covenant be attached to the deed prior to the sale of the property. J. McKay will provide the Bureau of Right-of-Way with the appropriate language for the deed. Prior to writing the covenant, McKay will inspect the interior of the property and will coordinate with the Jeanne Ferrar of the Keene Heritage Commission. They may want to hold the covenant on the building.

**New London 14884. Participants: Christine Perron, Mike Dugas, and Jim Marshall.**

Mike Dugas provided an overview of the project. The project consists of expanding an existing Park & Ride facility located on 103A off Exit 12 of Interstate 89 in the Town of New London. Currently, this Park & Ride has 45 parking spaces and the facility is regularly overcrowded. This project proposes to increase parking capacity to approximately 200 spaces. The expansion will utilize land that is already owned by the Department and is heavily wooded.

There are stonewalls on the property, as well as a pile of stones at the northeast corner of the existing facility. J. Garvin suggested that the large size of these stones could indicate that they had been part of a foundation rather than fieldstones piled by a farmer. Given the property's potential archeological sensitivity, E. Feighner asked that a Phase IA/IB archaeological survey be completed prior to construction. As the goal is to build this project next year, J. McKay stated that the survey should be completed this fall; however the service agreement for this work will not be in place until early to mid-October.

**\*\*Memos:** Pembroke 14477A; Durham 13868-X-A000(068), 14404-X-A000(344).

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager